



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,314	05/23/2007	Yukitaka Hayakawa	2006-1019A	9815
513	7590	06/23/2010	EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.			CHARLES, MARCUS	
1030 15th Street, N.W.,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 400 East				3656
Washington, DC 20005-1503				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/23/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com
eo@wenderoth.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/584,314	HAYAKAWA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Marcus Charles	3656

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the amendment filed 3-19-2010, which has been entered.

Claims 1-3, 5-20 are currently pending.

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The examiner has accepted the drawing filed with this application as formal drawing.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for "an edge does not result from grinding between the guide face and the outer circumferential surface of the shaft of the shaft member" as in claim 1.the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 1-6 and 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, the claim recited an edge which does not result from grinding. The scope of the recitation is confusing because it is not clear if the edge is part of the final product of the claimed invention. If the edge is not

part of final product of the invention, then the phrase does not make any patentable sense. It appears that the recitation is part of a method step to the final product.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-6 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takehana et al. (6,851,859) in view GB (2197427). Takehana et al. discloses a hydrodynamic bearing device comprising a shaft (30) member; a radially bearing portion (60) having a radial bearing gap (see 63) formed around an outer circumference of the shaft and supporting the shaft member in the radial direction in a non-contact manner by an action of dynamic pressure of fluid in the radial bearing gap; the shaft member has a guide face serving as a guide when a thrust ring (33) is pres fitted unto the shaft (30), wherein the shaft includes a flat face at an apex thereof. Takehana et al. fail to disclose a blunting portion formed between guide surface and the outer circumference and the shaft member adjacent to the guide face the blunting portion having a shape in which an edge is blunted. GB (2197427) discloses a hydrodynamic bearing device comprising a shaft member (11) having a guide surface serving as a guide surface area (not labeled), a blunting portion (18) formed between the guide surface and the outer circumferential surface of the shaft, wherein the blunting portion is formed at a boundary

in a shape of a curved that is smoothly continuous from the guide face to the outer circumferential, wherein the boundary has no edge. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to modify the shaft of Takehana et al. so that it includes a blunting portion which is a curved surface that is smoothly continuous from a guide face to the outer circumferential surface in view of GB (2197427) in order to allow for easy access through the bearing hole and to prevent burring at the edge of the shaft after assembling. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the top surface of the shaft of Takehana et al. so that it has a blunted portion in view of Mori et al. in order to allow for smooth entry and uninterrupted guidance onto the shaft.

In claims 4, 8-9, note the blunting portion of GB (2197427) has a curved surface.

In claims 5, 10-12 and 14-18 note Takehana et al. discloses the member (50) holding the disc (D).

In claims 6, 13-16 and 19-20 Takehana et al. disclose the claimed invention in fig. 1.

Regarding claims 2-3, the method of forming the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore, this limitation has not been given patentable weight. In addition, grinding is a well known process for rounding of edges.

In claim 7, the method steps are inherently included during the manufacturing of Takehana et al and GB (2197427) device, including the boundary portion has no edge.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Citation

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Note the prior art cited in attached PTO Form 892.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marcus Charles whose telephone number is (571) 272-

7101. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ridley Richard can be reached on (571) 272-6917. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Marcus Charles
/Marcus Charles/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3656